	Case 2:24-cv-00944-DC-SCR Documen	t 29 Filed 11/21/24 Page 1 of 3
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	CHRISTIAN LIFE CENTER, INC.,	No. 2:24-cv-00944-DC-SCR
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
14	FORD MOTOR COMPANY, et al,	FOR VOLUNTARY DISMISSAL OF ITS FEDERAL CLAIMS
15	Defendants.	(Doc. No. 21)
16		
17	This matter is before the court on Plaintiff's motion to voluntarily dismiss the two federal	
18	claims it brought in this lemon law case. (Doc. No. 21.) The pending motion was taken under	
19	submission to be decided on the papers pursuant to Local Rule 230(g). (Doc. No. 24.) For the	
20	reasons explained below, the court will deny Plaintiff's motion as improper.	
21	BACKGROUND	
22	On June 15, 2020, Plaintiff filed a complaint against Defendants Ford Motor Company	
23	and Big Valley Ford Lincoln in the San Joaquin County Superior Court. (Doc. Nos. 1 at ¶ 2; 1-2.)	
24	Plaintiff filed a first amended complaint to add Defendants Roush Industries, Inc., and Roush	
25	Performance, Inc., on February 10, 2022. (Doc. Nos. 1 at ¶ 3; 1-3.) On March 1, 2024, Plaintiff	
26	filed a second amended complaint pursuant to a stipulation between the parties. (Doc. No. 22-1 at	
27	¶ 9.) That same day, Plaintiff filed the operative second amended complaint against Defendants	
28	Ford Motor Company and Kovington Performance Holdings, Inc. doing business as Roush	
		1

Case 2:24-cv-00944-DC-SCR Document 29 Filed 11/21/24 Page 2 of 3

1 Performance, Inc. (collectively, "Defendants"), bringing three claims for violations of the 2 California Song-Beverly Act and two claims for violations of the federal Magnuson-Moss 3 Warranty Act ("Magnuson-Moss"). (Doc. No. 1 at ¶ 4; 1-4.) On March 26, 2024, Defendant Ford 4 Motor Company removed this action to this court with the consent of Defendant Roush 5 Performance, Inc. on the basis of federal question jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 6 1441, and 1446. (Doc. Nos. 1 at 2; 1-1 at ¶ 29.) 7 On May 6, 2024, Plaintiff filed the pending motion to voluntary dismiss its Magnuson-8 Moss claims without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(2). (Doc. No. 21.) 9 Defendants filed oppositions to the motion on May 20, 2024. (Doc. Nos. 22–23.) Plaintiff then 10 filed replies in support of its motion on May 29, 2024. (Doc. Nos. 25–26.) 11

DISCUSSION

Plaintiff seeks to dismiss its Magnuson-Moss claims without prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(2). (Doc. No. 21.) However, Rule 41(a) concerns dismissal of an entire action or all claims against a particular defendant. eCASH Techs., Inc. v. Guagliardo, 35 F. App'x 498, 499 (9th Cir. 2002) (citing Gen. Signal Corp. v. MCI Telecomms. Corp., 66 F.3d 1500, 1513 (9th Cir. 1995)). When a plaintiff seeks to dismiss only certain claims against a defendant, Rule 41(a) does not apply. See Ethride v. Harbor House Rest., 861 F.2d 1389, 1392 (9th Cir. 1998) ("A plaintiff may not use Rule 41(a)(1)(i) to dismiss, unilaterally, a single claim from a multi-claim complaint."); see also Hells Canyon Pres. Council v. U.S. Forest Serv., 403 F.3d 683, 687–89 (9th Cir. 2005) (applying the same reasoning for Rule 41(a)(2)). Instead, the Ninth Circuit has held that Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15 is the appropriate mechanism to dismiss individual claims. Hells Canyon, 403 F.3d at 687–89; Gen. Signal Corp., 66 F.3d at 1513.

Although Plaintiff acknowledges Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15 in its replies, the instant motion is not a motion for leave to amend pursuant to Rule 15. Accordingly, the court will deny Plaintiff's pending motion to dismiss its two federal claims pursuant to Rule 41(a) as improper.

27

///

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

28 ///

Case 2:24-cv-00944-DC-SCR Document 29 Filed 11/21/24 Page 3 of 3

1	CONCLUSION	
2	For the reasons explained above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:	
3	1. Plaintiff's motion for voluntary dismissal of its fourth and fifth causes of action	
4	pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a) is denied; and	
5	2. To the extent Plaintiff intends to seek leave to amend its pleadings, Plaintiff shall	
6	file a motion for leave to amend no later than twenty-one (21) days from the date	
7	of entry of this order and must comply with Local Rule 137(c).	
8		
9	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
10	Dated: November 20, 2024 Dena Coggins	
11	United States District Judge	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
'1C)		